

Message

From: Cullen, Raymond [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CB92E061502245D9BE5AB9D24919A3C9-RCULLEN]
Sent: 2/1/2017 9:42:37 PM
To: Choi, Sangsook [choi.sangsook@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: ArcelorMittal inspection

Other than the occasional email about the situation, all of which I'll forward to you, SF hasn't provided me with anything substantial like a report or anything like that. But, here's a summary of what has gone down so far:

On 1/12-1/13/17, Mike Beslow and Andrew Maguire, SF OSCs, inspected ArcelorMittal's Indiana Harbor facility with the USCG and IDEM based on an anonymous report of oil sheen on water. Separately, a crane operator at the facility noticed the sheen and reported it to the appropriate people at the facility, but they never reported it to EPA. IDEM believes the sheen is from ArcelorMittal, who denies it. Mike observed a sheen mainly at Outfall 009 and also at Outfalls 010 and 001 and took split samples for fingerprinting with the facility. Flow from Outfall 009 is > 100M gpd.

Mike resampled on 1/17/17. I told him the parameters I'd like analyzed. At the time, he also took two samples of sediment at 001 to learn whether the oil in the sediment is identical to the oil sheen on the canal surface, which would show that the sheen is caused by agitation of the sediment and not directly from the outfall. As of today, I'm still waiting for the results of the NPDES and sediment sampling.

Mike said he saw oil slugs at 009 & 010 and an ongoing sheen at 001 (in an 1/25/17 email, he stated that he knows of five oil slug discharges in the past 2 weeks). He explained that it's possible that waste oil from a truck may have spilled into a drain that goes to 009 & 010. The facility discharges used oil lubricant to these outfalls.

Would you mind seeing if a vehicle is available for our visit?

Thanks.

From: Choi, Sangsook
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 3:57 PM
To: Cullen, Raymond <cullen.raymond@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ArcelorMittal inspection

Thanks Ray.

Maybe we need to have SF provide some reports to understand situation better.

Is SF providing any to you?

From: Cullen, Raymond
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 3:27 PM
To: Choi, Sangsook <choi.sangsook@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ArcelorMittal inspection

Thursday's good. SF last let me know about a sheen discharge on 1/26, as reported by ArcelorMittal, bringing the total number of sheen discharges in the last 2 weeks to a half dozen or so. Also, by the way, Tom Mendez told me he witnessed improper sampling for FOG at Outfalls 009 & 010 by the facility (transferring of samples between containers). I still haven't received the results of sampling SF did on 1/17.

From: Choi, Sangsook
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 11:00 AM

To: Cullen, Raymond <cullen.raymond@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: ArcelorMittal inspection

Hi Ray,

How about Thursday? I am out on Tuesday.
I will call the facility so that they know we are coming.

Also, did you hear anything from SF?

From: Cullen, Raymond

Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 10:24 AM

To: Choi, Sangsook <choi.sangsook@epa.gov>

Subject: ArcelorMittal inspection

Good morning, Sangsook. I'm not sure if Ryan mentioned this to you already, but he told me he'd like us to inspect ArcelorMittal's Indiana Harbor facility next week, if you're available then (he was hoping we'd actually do it this week, but I'm currently on a PCI). He wants a credentialed NPDES inspector (you) to witness firsthand the oil sheen issues that Superfund has been seeing, at least. He also recommended determining compliance with the NPDES narrative standards and tracing the flow to the outfalls of concern to see where oil could potentially enter, plus anything else you feel is necessary.

I'm available all next week except Wed. I'm not sure if we'll need a full day to inspect this place or if a half day will suffice, but if it's the latter, I'd prefer Mon or Tues morning because there are trainings the afternoon of those days that I'd like to attend if possible. Otherwise, no worries. Please let me know when you think we should get this done.

Thanks!